REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 19 and 21-24 are now pending in the Application with claims 1 and 14 being independent claims. Claims 1, 14, 19 and 21 have been amended. Claims 18 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-8 and 12-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Olnowich (U.S. Patent 5,734,826) ("Olnowich").

Applicant respectfully traverses. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). Further, "anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, <u>arranged as in the claim</u>." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Emphasis added.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 and 12-24 recite elements not disclosed by Olnowich. For example, claim 1 recites: "a switch configured for *selectively* passing one CRC calculation value included in the plurality of CRC calculation values, the passed CRC calculation value being calculated by one of said plurality of CRC calculation blocks". The Patent Office cites Column 3, Line 27 through Column 4, Line 7 of Olnowich as teaching the above-referenced elements of the present invention. (Pending Office Action, Page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree. In the present invention, a switch is implemented which is configured for selectively passing one CRC calculation value (selected/chosen from a plurality of CRC calculation values) to a CRC register. (Present Application, Paragraph 0005). The cited portion of Olnowich merely mentions a

switching network in which redundancy bytes are appended to a message (Olnowich, Column 3, Lines 46-48) and *does not* discuss implementation of a switch which is configured for selectively passing one CRC calculation value selected out of a plurality of CRC calculation values.

Further, Independent Claim 14 recites: "selecting one of: the first CRC value and the second CRC value as the CRC output value, wherein the selection of one of: the first CRC value and the second CRC value is accomplished by a switch selection signal". The Patent Office cites Column 16, Lines 21-50 of Olnowich as teaching the above-referenced elements of the present invention. (Pending Office Action, Page 6). Applicants respectfully disagree. In the present invention, a method for calculating a CRC value with a variable width data input may include: selecting/selectively passing one of a plurality of CRC values to a CRC register (ex. – via a switch/switch selection signal). (Present Application, Paragraph 0015). The cited portion of Olnowich merely discusses a multiplexer which feeds bytes of a message one-by-one to a network. (Olnowich, Column 16, Lines 28-31) and *does not* discuss selectively passing one of a plurality of CRC values to a CRC register.

Thus, under *Lindemann*, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established for claims 1 and 14. Claims 2-8, 12-13, 15-17, 19 and 21-24 are believed allowable based on their dependence upon allowable base claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Patent Office rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olnowich in view of Yang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,478) ("Yang").

Applicant respectfully traverses. "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some

suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, <u>the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations</u>." (emphasis added) (MPEP § 2143). <u>If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.</u> (emphasis added) *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim 9 is believed allowable based on its dependence upon an allowable base claim.

The Patent Office rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olnowich in view of Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,686) ("Yamazaki"). Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 10 is believed allowable based on its dependence upon an allowable base claim.

The Patent Office rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olnowich in view of Abbott (U.S. Patent No. 6,351,142) ("Abbott"). Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 11 is believed allowable based on its dependence upon an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the forgoing amendments and arguments, reconsideration of the claims is hereby requested, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
LSI Corporation,

Dated: September 18, 2008   By: _____
Jeffrey M. Andersen
Reg. No. 52,558

SUITER · SWANTZ PC LLO
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220
Omaha, NE 68154
(402) 496-0300   telephone
(402) 496-0333   facsimile